Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*

Editorial Office 1323 M STREET, WASHINGTON 5, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066

VOL. V, NO. 51, *Issue Number* 256, DECEMBER 22, 1948 ★ *Editors:* FELIX MORLEY & FRANK C. HANIGHEN

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA DEC 28 1948 LIBRARY

IN A BROADER FRAMEWORK

by Felix Morley

Christmas is before all else a time of goodwill. It is a time at which we respond to the impulsion to combat our personal shortcomings. On the anniversary of the birth of Christ, the beam in one's own eye appropriately receives that consideration which is so easy to apply to defects in the vision of others.

In that spirit, HUMAN EVENTS recalls -- metaphorically and to some extent literally -- its Analysis of September 22, entitled A Solemn Warning. HUMAN EVENTS prides itself on an outspoken defense of the American tradition, and is accustomed to equally forthright reactions from its readers. But, in nearly five years of publication, no expression of our opinion has aroused more interest than the one now re-examined. None has brought more praise; none more censure.

It is therefore reasonable to conclude that this Analysis, whatever its shortcomings, came close to the heart of a really vital issue. In the belief that the subject is of deep concern, A Solemn Warning was originally voiced. With that conviction it is now reviewed.

Let it be clear that this review is not made under duress. Some correspondents have asked us to retract, while others have urged us to repeat the argument in sharper terms. But these requests have not been coupled with either threats or blandishments, to both of which HUMAN EVENTS can say: We are not subject.

However, during the three months since A Solemn Warning was published, we have reflected deeply on the issue involved. And now, at Christmas, we seek to place the problem in a broader framework, less subject to misinterpretation; more satisfactory for our own sense of absolute justice.

II

A Solemn Warning, for readers who may have missed it, was written immediately after the horrible assassination of Count Bernadotte, in Jerusalem. It also referred, scathingly, to the attempt of a Jewish organization in New York to promote a boycott of all British products, including even the Olivier production of "Hamlet".

Warmth of language, occasioned by revulsion against the murder of a peacemaker, undoubtedly contributed to misunderstanding of the motive underlying this article. It should therefore now be emphasized that the

Copyright 1948 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Jewish anguish over the killing of Bernadotte was as complete and poignant as could possibly have been expected.

A Solemn Warning argued that anti-Semitism in the United States is being tragically aggravated by what for lack of a more accurate term we called "Semitism". This was defined "as the constant effort of a large number of Jews to assert themselves as Jews". We deplored the presumable consequences of this development and noted that: "Fortunately, there are still many Americans of Jewish blood . . . who are doing all they can to keep it from going further." The article then ventured upon some criticism of political Zionism, so far as it operates to involve all the American people in a foreign entanglement where dangerous implications are not well understood.

The refusal of the United Nations to extend membership to the new State of Israel, at the present time, could be cited as justification for this part of the warning. And in two other respects the reaction, from Jewish readers, seemed fully to warrant what we had written.

In the first place many Jews, from all parts of the country, took the trouble to write letters of warm appreciation. There was, in the minds of these non-Zionist Jews, no feeling that the article was anything but sympathetic with Jewish problems, so far as these problems can or should be segregated as such.

In the second place, more than one Zionist, in attacking the article, suggested that any criticism of the State of Israel and its Zionist affiliates in the United States is fundamentally anti-Semitic. In justifying this dubious argument one critic said that American Jews "react as Jews only on two issues: Zionism and Civil Rights".

That statement brings us directly to the crux, for it so happens that these two issues bear directly upon two principles continuously emphasized by the Founding Fathers as basic to the character of this Republic. The principle affected by political Zionism is that emphasized by George Washington in the Farewell Address: "Nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular Nations, and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded." The principle affected by centralized pressure in the field of Civil Rights is that safeguarded by the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution:

> "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

It may be argued that our Federal Republic is now being made over into a centralized empire, and that the political wisdom of George Washington is no longer applicable to modern problems. But even if that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were granted it would still be undeniable that for any Jew to take a position hostile to historic American principles "as Jew", would be to extend an invitation for criticism of him "as Jew".

III

One result of A Solemn Warning, however, was to convince us that group activity by Jews, as Jews, is happily tending to focus on less controversial lines, as time serves to mitigate the dreadful emotional consequences of the Nazi atrocities. There was evidence of this in the generous and understanding reaction of many individual Jews to the article in question. There is further evidence in assurance given us, by a responsible officer of the Anti-Defamation League, that: "The attitude of American Jews on the subjects of Zionism and Civil Rights, as on all other subjects, is based on individual judgment and conscience."

Finally there is evidence, if more were needed, in the age-old opposition of the Jewish people to regimentation by any human authority. It was Lord Acton who pointed out that civilization owes to the ancient Hebrew nation "the principle that all political authorities must be tested and reformed according to a code which was not made by man".

It therefore seems incumbent upon HUMAN EVENTS to say frankly that on two counts the article under review fell short of that standard of objective justice which even polemical writing, so long as it is in the Liberal tradition, should seek to sustain. We might argue that A Solemn Warning was too compressed to give adequate attention to the persecutions which have operated to drive Jews into what were called "Semitic" activities. But we found space to denounce the boycott activity of a probably unimportant and certainly unrepresentative extremist group.

The second count on which we indict ourselves was the failure to emphasize more strongly that every conclusion drawn in the earlier article is of a general character. These criticisms would apply, mutatis mutandis, to any group of Americans which concentrates on a special political interest to the exclusion of the interest of the whole, and which organizes political pressure in behalf of its special concern.

Although the Zionists provide a current illustration, they certainly did not originate the pressure group tactics which the founders of our Republic condemned under the name of "factionalism". During the drafting of the Constitution it was clearly recognized that factionalism is particularly dangerous for a people of such diverse origins as the Americans, and to a form of government in which no religious, political or economic interest is given legal priority over any other. This equality before the law encourages factionalism, because it leaves any group

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

free to organize and exert pressure for its particular interest. But this very freedom places the deepest moral obligation on the group to be most circumspect in all activities affecting those without the same incentive.

Without this self-restraint, as Madison argued brilliantly in Number 10 of the Federalist, the death of our Republic may be anticipated. And in this essay Madison warns us further that a policy of centralization will greatly increase the dangers of factionalism. Only as long as "local and particular" interests are left in the hands of the states will the Federal form of government serve to control the evil effects of faction. Yet Madison was optimistic:

> "A religious sect may degenerate into a political faction in a part of the Confederacy; but the variety of sects dispersed over the entire face of it must secure the national councils against any danger from that source."

IV

Many American Jews are worried lest, through the agency of political Zionism, their spiritual strength "may degenerate into a political faction". Before the recent election, for instance, a Jewish organization took pains to publicize Woodrow Wilson's belief that: "A man who thinks of himself as belonging to a particular national group in America has not yet become an American."

Political Zionism is perhaps a transient example of that factional spirit which wise leadership, from Washington to Wilson, has recognized as injurious. Moreover, any fair appraisal must recognize the harrowing background which gives this movement unusual idealistic and emotional appeal. As the French say: "Comprendre tout, c'est pardonner tout."

The political agitation of Irish-Americans died down as the Republic of Eire attained its freedom. The same outcome should be expected in the case of Israeli-Americans, now that the State of Israel has become an accomplished political fact. This Christmas, the land of the Nativity seems much closer to lasting peace than was the case a year ago. Undoubtedly this great accomplishment owes much to the support and encouragement forthcoming from American Jews.

But whether Israel is here to stay is less important to us than the question of whether certain fundamental American ideals, too easily forgotten, are also here to stay. The world would be a poorer place, with even less occasion for the Christmas spirit, if these ideals could no longer be zealously defended.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1323 M Street, N. W., Washington 5, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) and foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events December 22, 1948

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA RECEIVED DEC 28 1948 LIBRARY

By Frank C. Hanighen

This week, in an especially daring mood, we must come out foursquare for the Christmas Tree. Not that we perceive any frontal drive by New Deal columnists on this symbol of the spirit of goodwill which has suffered so much in recent years. But these contemporaries are up to so many things, in their ignorance, that eventually the bedizened pine might be shorn of its meaning and be left with only its empty trinkets. This idea occurred to us as we were thinking back forty years when we literally lived under the spell of the Tree. One remembrance led to another until we were reflecting on how times have changed for the worse. Those were the days when many believed that an international body in the Hague would establish international justice. President William Howard Taft was for it, and his jovial, unvindictive character gave warmth and authority to the new development. Never did our elders think then that an international tribunal would become an odious example of "judging in our own cause", nor that it would hang generals for doing something that our own generals had lately done to Spain. And this thought led us to reflect sadly that today, while we have international courts for so-called justice, we have no international apparatus for the age-old principle of appeal, nor of clemency. As the shadow of the scaffold falls in Tokyo, it becomes unfortunately clear that we have repealed the quality of mercy.

Nevertheless, there it stands, the Tree, immovable despite changes in the world. Or does it? Hardly a week goes by that someone like Marquis Childs, or Joseph Alsop, or Tom Stokes, doesn't wax satirical at the expense of Members of Congress because they do not, it seems, understand that they cannot resist "change". We retort (softly, of course, since it's Christmas) that we might just as well lampoon poor Mr. Kerensky for opposing the sinister figures who got off at the Finland Station to overthrow his experiment in free, representative government; or poor Mr. Bruening for opposing the Nazis with their pogroms and parliament-burning.

We would mind less these advocates of change at any price, if they did not implicitly bid us (like Mrs. Gradgrind), to "go and be something-ological directly". For we fear that some new "ideological" nostrum is about to be born, some new "ism" will follow the Truman victory. It's an old, but good, saw that Fascism will come in the guise of fighting Fascism, and Communism while fighting Communism. At this point, we drop our pessimism and say a good word (it's about time, some readers will say) for Mr. Truman. Such a new crusade would, in the next four years, need to enlist the President as "leader". Frankly, H. T. just doesn't seem to fill the bill. To quote Dickens again, we can hardly look on Mr. Truman as Mr. Chadband looked on someone else, as a "soaring boy". A good deal of imagination is needed to picture Mr. Truman as "soaring". We can't envisage the portentous frown of a Mussolini or Trotsky on the simple brow of our President. That certainty indeed is a present which we can fondle under the Christmas Tree.

* * * * *

"We are accused by the Palestine Post of engaging in an 'orgy of humanitarianism'", writes an official of the Friends Service Committee, who is doing relief work among the 400,000 Arab refugees from Zionist imperialism. "Each new battle", says the Friend, "increases the number of homeless refugees. . . . Winter has come and these poor people are suffering. For this reason we ask that you spread this story through your organizations, the newspapers and radio in order to secure assistance now. Gifts should be labelled 'For Palestinian Arab Relief' and sent through World Service, 214 East 21st Street, New York 10, N. Y." We are glad to offer our column to publicity for this sort of an "orgy" in which these gentle Friends are engaging.

* * * * *

Copyright 1948 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hiss and Chambers, in their unwonted publicity, are certainly sitting for portraits, for the benefit of innumerable students of personality. The former has enjoyed much better treatment up to now. But, since the indictment, the flavor of press accounts has become acrid and merciless. It is to be hoped that Hiss will not be subjected to the sort of journalistic cruelty which has marked so much coverage of criminal causes celebres. He deserves a fair chance in the coming trial without witch-hunting, of which, as a matter of fact, there has been mighty little, the so-called liberals to the contrary notwithstanding.

As a personality, Hiss is a recognizable Washington type. In literature, one may find, in John Marquand's novel B. F.'s Daughter, a portrait of the young New Dealer on-the-make, the husband of "B. F.'s" daughter. "The intelligentsia, the bright planners, working on those streamlined blueprints for a brave new world, were always repeating themselves. She [B. F.'s daughter] had heard enough of the coined jargon that was all mixed up with cheap synonyms. It made no sense. There was something mechanical about Tom and all those boys with minds like steel traps, minds equipped with dogmatic lucidity. There was some basic lack of understanding in spite of all their attitudes. They had convictions, but they seemed to be working out just what the war was all about. They stood for freedom of speech except for disloyal Fascist columnists, freedom from fear except that Tom was going to put the fear of God into certain industrialists who still lived in the Dark Ages, and freedom from want, except for the obstructionists who could not see the light."

Chambers is quite another kettle of fish. He's not a Dostoievski character, as some commentators have said, nor even (although this is closer) the protagonist in Koestler's Darkness at Noon. American literature has apparently not produced a type-character illustrating the clash between the workings of the Oriental nihilistic conspiracy and an American soul. So far Chambers, who is to say the least a complex person, appears to have shown an old, almost forgotten American trait -- the desire to hurt no one unnecessarily in his exposures; and precious little credit he has received for this. We would like to think that his internal crisis reached its climax when he faced a choice of loyalties. Whittaker Chambers, back in those days in 1937-38, may have finally reached the conclusion that, after all, he was an American first.

* * * * *

The Olympic battle that came to a close with the Hiss indictment was not fundamentally a fight between the House Committee and the Administration; it was actually a fight between J. Edgar Hoover and Attorney General Clark. When the FBI learned that Clark's plan was to indict Chambers instead of Hiss, the Bureau went into action. As policemen, they knew that indictment of the former Communist would prevent other Communists from turning State's evidence. Accordingly the House Un-American Activities Committee received help and encouragement from Mr. Hoover's men. It is no slighting of the very capable staff of the Committee, nor of the courageous leaders, Mundt and Nixon, to say that much of the recent investigative work could only have been accomplished with the help of the FBI. As an example, the detailed business of connecting up the "typewriter" evidence (which is said to have clinched the case) needed the talents of Mr. Hoover's men.

* * * * *

There is a great deal of talk about the selection of a new Secretary of State, and as usual when the fate of the nation depends on a proper choice, discussion ranges over all sorts of absurd qualifications, rather than on real ability and fitness. Thus, the magnitude of sums contributed to the Democratic war chest by such varying potential candidates as Lewis Douglas, Averell Harriman, Anthony J. Drexel

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Biddle have become the subject of earnest argument among Capital seers. And when Justice Vinson's name comes up, it goes immediately to the bottom of the list. Why? Because, they say, he wants that $20,000 a year for life. Likewise, the tepid attitudes of Ambassador Douglas and Secretary Forrestal towards Mr. Truman's campaign fight for political survival are recalled, with many a head shake. Dean Acheson's candidacy has taken a slump since the indictment of Mr. Hiss. Meanwhile other stars twinkle in the firmament -- Ambassador Steinhardt, General Lucius Clay, Justice Douglas, among others.

One development alone spices this dreary prattle. There has been a move, how serious it cannot be determined, to persuade Mr. Truman to name Senator Vandenberg to the post. It is claimed that such Democratic politicos as Les Biffle (H. T.'s graying eminence), Jim Farley and Senator McGrath are behind the idea. In any case, we learn from reliable sources that the Michigan Senator will have none of it. Perhaps the news that three Democratic bosses like the idea has chilled a man who is a biographer of Alexander Hamilton. He tells friends that he would be foolish to accept: The Republicans would naturally hate him, and the Democrats would blame him for anything that goes wrong in the foreign field.

* * * * *

Wilhelm Roepke in Time and Tide (December 11) has written an article that must dash cold water on the hopes of such people as our recent contributor, Mr. Harvey, who proposes a "free enterprise" state within the increasingly socialistic U. S. Roepke points to the experience in Germany where the various autarkic zones have contributed to the general economic failure and are now under process of merging. "The German experience teaches us that regional Socialism is incompatible with the unity of the nation. Inversely, it follows that, if the unity of the nation is to be preserved under Socialism, the central government dare not allow the regions even that minimum of autonomy without which self-government and federalism become a farce. Now we see quite clearly that Socialism and federalism are mutually exclusive. For if there is regional Socialism (as in post-war Germany), it destroys the national community -- but if Socialism is national, then it destroys the political life of the lesser communities such as the states in the U. S. A., the cantons in Switzerland, the municipalities in other countries. Under Socialism, either the parts eat up the center, or the center the parts. In the latter case, what might still be called federalism would be at best only folklore federalism. The much-advertised 'federalism' of Soviet Russia or Yugoslavia is nothing but a propagandist fiction which can deceive only the ignorant.

"The Allies", he goes on, "have now discovered that they cannot organize Western Germany as a federal state if at the same time they retain the Socialist economic system which they inherited from the Nazis. The recent monetary and economic reforms show that the Allies, together with responsible Germans, prefer a combination of federalism and free economy whereas the Socialists -- German and British -- prefer a combination of centralism and Socialism." And Mr. Roepke points out that the same dilemma faces the federal State of Switzerland.

"For either cantonal Socialism would break up the Swiss union, or a Socialist system comprising the whole country would make a sham of federalism and self-government. The wise authors of the Swiss constitution seem to have been aware of the fact that the existence of a federal State is bound up with a free economy, for they insert a special Article making this particular economic system the only constitutional one. It is also possible to interpret the 5th and 14th Amendments of the American Constitution in the same way."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Events

Three Who Made a Revolution; a Biographical History, by Bertram D. Wolfe. New York: The Dial Press. $5.00. Reviewed by J. M. Lalley.

This, I should say, is an extremely valuable work, and evidently the fruit of many years of patient investigation. It has to do with the vicissitudes of Bolshevist movement before 1917 and with the earlier careers of the three men who emerged from utter obscurity to stamp their characters indelibly on all the subsequent history of the Twentieth Century. Mr. Wolfe has carefully separated the true stories of Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov, Lev Davidovich Bronstein, and Yosif Djugashvili, known to us, respectively, as Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin, from the glamor of party myths and the distortions of official hagiographies. One result of his labors is that M. de Jouvenel could find here much support for his thesis (HUMAN EVENTS, December 15) that the great political prophets of our time are in truth so many "earnest, systematic, scientific madmen", driven by "titanic dreams".

Mr. Wolfe's triad, at any rate, seems to have been men for whom a universe exterior to their dreams scarcely existed. It was said of Lenin by the Menshevik, Axelrod, that he alone, among the various Russian political exiles in Western Europe, in the early part of the century, was capable of living every hour of every day in his revolutionary fantasy, and slept only that he might dream of revolution. To his fantasy Lenin gave the whole power of his relentless will and exhaustless energy; to it he was prepared to sacrifice every moral scruple and every consideration of personal loyalty. Herein, no doubt, lay his advantage over intra-party adversaries such as the celebrated Plekhanov, for whom the Marxist dialectic was primarily a kind of intellectual sport and the Socialist newspapers and congresses mere playgrounds for his eloquence and wit. Trotsky's special fantasy seems to have been of an order somewhat different from Lenin's. Trotsky was the precocious schoolboy grown into the political pedant, and living, like Robespierre and Louis Blanc before him, in a private universe of pure abstractions. Neither people nor the rest of nature existed for him apart from the categories to which he assigned them. Thus, where Lenin was the pragmatical madman whose favorite word was "ruthless", Trotsky was the rationalistic madman whose favorite word was "impersonal". In Stalin, if we accept Mr. Wolfe's interpretation, we have yet another variety of political lunatic, for whom the whole of reality is comprised of conspiracy, devious intrigue and maneuver. He is the demoniac party hack, the patient and adroit conniver in committee, who has discovered and applied on an undreamed of scale the methods of the old-fashioned Tammany boss. But, Stalin, if we may trust Mr. Wolfe, lacked imagination to create an eschatological vision of his own, and so he simply appropriated those of Lenin and Trotsky.

In all this, there seems proof that the Bolshevist revolution was in fact the historical repudiation of the gospel of Marx. It is a central Marxist doctrine that ideas are engendered by economic circumstances and that historical figures are the mere puppets of predeterminate and irresistible material forces. But the plain fact is that in the social and moral confusion which followed the collapse of the Romanov dynasty, Lenin and Trotsky, representing no influential body of Russian opinion, commanding no more than a handful of followers, and until then wholly unknown to the world at large, were able to impress their own mad apocalypse on the revolution. Another plain fact is that in the moral and social chaos of our own Society, Stalin has succeeded in imposing his borrowed vision upon a great part of the earth, which has come to resemble a vast enlargement of the lunatic asylum, described by Poe, in which patients and guardians had changed places. And so we face the monstrous paradox of an Age of Reason and humanitarianism that has ended in the most inhuman irrationalism ever heard of.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED